

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 41 are in the application. Claim 12 is currently amended and claims 1 through 11 and 13 through 41 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

No new matter is added to the application.

Claim 12 is amended to correct an informality therein. Specifically, claim 12 is currently amended to correct an obvious typographical error therein, as indicated in the listing of claims included hereinabove.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1-41 were rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,959,529 to Kail, IV (hereinafter, Kail). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1, 14, and 27 (grouped and discussed together in the Office Action), Applicants respectfully submit that the cited and relied upon Kail does not disclose each and every element of the claims. Each of claims 1, 14, and 27 relates to a search of a network for sensor measurements associated with a location and acquisition from the network a plurality of sensor measurements associated with the location. Moreover, the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities.

However, the cited and relied upon Kail fails to disclose, at least, a method, a medium, an apparatus, or a system for acquiring a plurality of sensor measurements associated with a location from a network, where the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities.

Regarding the cited and relied upon Kail, Applicants note that Kail appears to disclose an apparatus and method for remotely monitoring the status of a living or inanimate subject. The Kail disclosed apparatus includes a portable monitoring unit having at least one sensor associated

with the subject and a central monitoring device that may communicate with a number of the portable monitoring units. (See Kail, col. 1, ln. 66 - col. 3, ln. 11.) The number of sensors 28, including internal sensor 28a and external sensor 28b, associated with a particular subject (or subject location) are collectively associated with a single, common portable monitoring unit 12. (See Kail, FIGS. 1, 2, and col. 4, ln. 10-41) Kail also discloses that a central monitoring device 14, including wireless connected central monitoring device 14a and landline connected central monitoring device 14b, may monitor many different portable monitoring units 12.

However, while Kail discloses that a central monitoring device 14 may monitor many different portable monitoring units 12, there is no disclosure or suggestion by Kail that the plurality of sensor measurements associated with a particular subject (location) are obtained by a plurality of entities. That is, Kail fails to disclose or suggest acquiring from a network a plurality of sensor measurements associated with a location, wherein the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities, as claimed by Applicants.

Each particular subject (location) monitored by a portable monitoring unit in Kail has one or more sensors associated therewith. That is, the cited and relied upon Kail discloses a monitoring apparatus wherein measurements associated with a location are acquired by a single portable remote monitoring unit. Kail does not disclose or suggest associating sensors from a plurality of separate and distinct portable monitoring units (i.e., entities) with a single subject (location). Thus, it should be clear that Kail fails to disclose, at least, acquiring from a network a plurality of sensor measurements associated with the location, wherein the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that it would be erroneous and improper to interpret Kail as even suggesting acquiring from a network a plurality of sensor measurements associated with a location, wherein the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities, since such an interpretation of Kail would teach away from the fundamental objective of Kail which is to monitor the status of a subject (living or inanimate). Clearly, the subject, living or inanimate, cannot be at two locations at once. Thus, there is no disclosure, suggestion or need provided in Kail for the claimed acquiring from a

network a plurality of sensor measurements associated with a location, wherein the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 14, and 27 are patentable over the cited and relied upon Kail under 35 USC 102(b) for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Claims 2-13 depend from claim 1, claims 15-26 depend from claim 14, and claims 28-39 depend from claim 27. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-39 are patentable over the cited and relied upon Kail under 35 USC 102(b) for at least the same reasons stated above regarding claims 1, 14, and 27, respectively.

Regarding the rejection of claim 40, directed to a system to acquire location information, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 relates to a system wherein an identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities. Thus, claim 40 is worded similarly to claims 1, 14, and 27 with respect to the 35 USC 102(b) rejection and detailed discussion of same hereinabove. Again, the cited and relied upon Kail fails to disclose, at least, an apparatus or a system for acquiring a plurality of sensor measurements associated with a location from a network, where the identified plurality of sensor measurements are measurements obtained by a plurality of entities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claim 40.

Claim 41 depends from claim 40. Applicants submit that claim 41 is patentable over Kail for at least the same reasons stated above regarding claim 40.


Therefore, the reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC 102(b) rejection of claims 40 and 41 are requested, as is the allowance of claims 40 and 41.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully and earnestly solicit the allowance of claims 1-41. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

October 29, 2004
Date


Randolph P. Calhoun
Registration No. 45,371
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-5985